

REMARKS

Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62-68 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62 have been amended as shown on pages 2-5 of the Reply. Claims 1-42, 44, 48-51, 55, 57-58, and 61 have been canceled. New claims 63-68 have been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claims 43, 48, 52, 57, and 59

Claims 43, 48, 52, 57, and 59 are objected to because of minor informalities. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested in light of the cancellation of claims 48 and 57, and in light of the amendments to claims 43, 52, and 59 made herein.

II. Rejection of Claim 43 Under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Amended claim 43 recites *the at least one wireless access point is configured to service a call via the digital cordless handset utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, a telephone number, and wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number* – the call is serviceable via the digital cordless handset utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, the telephone number; and the call is serviceable via the cellular telephone using the telephone number. Accordingly, there is no gap between steps, and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the amendments to claim 43 made herein is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 43-58 Under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 43-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the cancellation of claims 44, 48-51, 55, and 57-58. Further, amended claim 43 recites *at least one wireless access point is configured to service a call via the digital cordless handset utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, a telephone number, and wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number* – the call is serviceable via the digital cordless handset

utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, the telephone number; and the call is serviceable via the cellular telephone using the telephone number.

Furthermore, amended claim 52 recites *servicing a call via an IEEE 802.11b wireless connection between a digital cordless handset and a wireless access point based on a telephone number if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset, wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number if the call is answered via the cellular telephone* – the call is serviced via an IEEE 802.11b wireless connection, based on a telephone number, if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset; and the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number if the call is answered via the cellular telephone. Accordingly, claims 43 and 52 are not vague and indefinite, and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the amendments to claims 43 and 52 made herein is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 43-49 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 43-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0141484) in view of Kallio (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0147008). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons: claims 44 and 48-49 have been canceled; and Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims. Independent claim 43, as amended, recites *at least one wireless access point is configured to service a call via the digital cordless handset utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, a telephone number, and wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number*.

(Support for this amendment can be found in the subject specification at, e.g., paragraph [0053]).

Rogalski *et al.* discloses providing wireless communications between a cellular telephone and a landline telephone without a physical communications connector. (See Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0024]); and Kallio discloses a dual-mode device that can roam between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN). (See Kallio at paragraph [0025]); however, neither Rogalski *et al.* nor Kallio, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest that *at least one wireless access point is configured to service a call via the digital cordless handset utilizing the IEEE 802.11b wireless connection based on, at least in part, a telephone number, and wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number*, as recited in amended claim 43.

Accordingly, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 43-49, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 50 and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 50 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio in view of Ogman *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0186676 A1). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the cancellation of claims 50 and 51 made herein.

VI. Rejection of Claims 52, 53, 57 and 58 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 52, 53, 57, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kallio in view of Ogman. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons: claims 57 and 58 have been canceled; and Kallio and Ogman *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

Kallio and Ogman fail to teach or suggest *servicing a call via an IEEE 802.11b wireless connection between a digital cordless handset and a wireless access point based on a telephone number if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset, wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number if the call is answered via the cellular telephone*, as recited in amended independent claim 52. Rather, Kallio merely discloses a dual-mode device that can roam between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN); and Ogman *et al.* merely discloses sharing a telephone number between different cellular phones operating over different regulated wireless networks.

Accordingly, claim 53 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 52 set forth above, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 54-56 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kallio and Ogman *et al.* in view of Moore, Jr. (U.S. Patent Pub. No 2003/0039242 A1). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: claim 55 has been canceled; and Rogalski *et al.*,

Kallio, and Ogman *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 54 and 56.

Moore, Jr. is generally directed to a mobile handset with voice over IP capability; however, Moore, Jr. does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kallio and Ogman *et al.* with respect to amended independent claim 52. For example, Moore, Jr. fails to teach or suggest *servicing a call via an IEEE 802.11b wireless connection between a digital cordless handset and a wireless access point based on a telephone number if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset, wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone using the telephone number if the call is answered via the cellular telephone*, as recited in amended independent claim 52.

Accordingly, claims 54 and 56 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 52 set forth above, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claim 59 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio and Ogman *et al.* in view of Jones *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,764). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Kallio, Ogman *et al.*, and Jones *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 59. Independent claim 59, as amended, recites *the wired data network is configured to service a call associated with a telephone number via a digital cordless handset and the Bluetooth wireless connection if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset, wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone connection based on the telephone number*.

Kallio merely discloses a dual-mode device that can roam between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN); Ogman *et al.* merely discloses sharing a telephone number between different cellular phones operating over different regulated wireless networks; and Jones *et al.* generally relates to a multi-mode mobile station; however, it is respectfully submitted that Kallio, Ogman *et al.*, and Jones *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest *the wired data network is configured to service a call associated with a telephone number via a digital cordless handset and the at least one of the IEEE 802.11b or the Bluetooth wireless connection if the call is answered via the digital cordless handset*,

wherein the call is serviceable via a cellular telephone connection based on the telephone number, as recited in amended dependent claim 59.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Assignee's representative submits this paper addresses all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections. A prompt action to allowance is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP290USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Assignee's undersigned representative at (216) 696-8730.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/
Keith E. Drabek
Reg. No. 60,757

AT&T Legal Department – T&W
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921